

## REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested for claims 1-8 and 10-19.

The undersigned wishes to thank Examiners Buckle and Canfield for their time, attention, and consideration during the interview that was conducted at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on July 27, 2009.

New drawings complying with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d) were required. New drawings are supplied as an Appendix.

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claim 1 has been amended to change the reference to traction "elements" to traction "element". Claim 1 has also been amended to clarify that the direction of traction force of the traction element is substantially parallel to a surface of the supporting structure. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is cordially urged.

Claims 1-7, 12, 13, 16 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,584,738 to *Andrä et al.* During the interview, it was agreed that claim 1 would overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and 102(b) if amended to recite that the clamping plate is supported on the base plate in a positive fit in a direction of "tension" in the traction element and that "the clamping plate comprises an integral downwardly protruding securing tappet which engages a securing surface of the base plate". During the interview, it was explained that the positive fit obtained via structures including the integral downwardly protruding securing tappet can minimize or avoid slippage between connected parts that is not achieved by connecting parts merely via adhesive and conventional bolts wherein the only connection between the clamping plate and the base plate is via bolts and adhesive.

The foregoing amendment to claim 1 has been adopted except that claim 1, as amended, further recites a “substantially” integral downwardly protruding securing tappet. By reciting that the securing tappet is “substantially integral”, it is intended that the claim cover downwardly extending structures such as bolts extending through holes in the clamping plate with sufficiently close tolerances that the bolts minimize or avoid slippage between connected parts to substantially the same degree that a completely integral downwardly extending structure does. As discussed during the interview, *Andrä et al.* has no integral structure. It also has no “substantially integral” structure.

In addition, subsequent to the interview, it was observed that it would be preferable to rewrite claims 3 and 4 in independent form because they relate to substantially integral structures that are more properly considered to be “upwardly extending”. It is submitted that these claims define patentably over *Andrä et al.* which, as noted, has no integral or “substantially” integral structure at all.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims, claims 1-8 and 10-19, are in condition for allowance. Allowance is cordially urged.

To the extent that any extensions of time are necessary in connection with this application it is requested that there be a standing petition for extension of time and that any additional fees that are required, or refunds due, in connection with this or any other paper filed in connection with this application be charged to Deposit Account 503015.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues, please  
contact the undersigned.

1217 King Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
(703) 299-0953

Date: August 17, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

WRB-IP LLP

By: /Harold R. Brown III/  
Harold R. Brown III  
Registration No. 36,341